DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 677 FL 024 969

AUTHOR Fouser, Robert J.
TITLE Pragmatic Transfer in Highly Advanced Learners: Some Preliminary Findings. CLCS Occasional Paper No. 50.
INSTITUTION Trinity Coll., Dublin (Ireland). Centre for Language and Communication Studies.
ISSN ISSN-0332-3889
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advanced Students; Foreign Countries; Interlanguage; *Japanese; *Korean; *Language Proficiency; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; Native Speakers; *Pragmatics; *Second Language Learning; *Transfer of Training; Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

This study investigated language transfer, particularly in the realm of pragmatics, in a native Korean-speaking student of advanced Japanese. A series of tasks including a verbal report were used to elicit Japanese production and comprehension data. Results indicate that the learner drew heavily on his native language in completing the tasks, but that in pragmatic areas of language his performance deviated from generally accepted linguistic norms to a greater degree than his overall language proficiency would indicate. It is concluded that although language transfer helps learners attain a high level of global proficiency in a closely-related target language, it may be less effective in helping them attain a similar level of pragmatic competence in that language. This suggests that metapragmatic knowledge and affective variables may have a greater influence on development of pragmatic competence than they do on the development of other areas of target-language competence. (Contains 63 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 415 677

TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

Centre for Language and Communication Studies

Pragmatic transfer in highly advanced learners: some preliminary findings

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Robert J. Fouser

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. E. Little

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CLCS Occasional Paper No.50

ISSN 0332 3889

Autumn 1997

FL024967

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLCS Occasional Papers

General Editor: D. G. Little

CLCS Occasional Papers report on research carried out within or in association with the Centre for Language and Communication Studies, and on research carried out elsewhere which is of special interest to the Centre's own concerns and activities. In some instances they present the texts of public lectures promoted by the Centre.

The following titles have been published and are available from The Secretary, Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College, Dublin 2.

Autumn 1981

1. D. M. Singleton, *Language transfer: a review of some recent research* (31pp.)
2. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Linguistics and oral tradition: the structural study of the riddle* (33pp.)
3. D. M. Singleton, *Age as a factor in second language acquisition* (70pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Summer 1982

4. Francis Nolan, *Voice quality and speech synthesis* (30pp.)
5. Roger Bennett, *Language elicitation procedures* (23pp.)

Winter 1982-3

6. S. M. Devitt, D. G. Little, S. P. Ó Conchúir & D. M. Singleton, *Learning Irish with* Anois is Aris (128pp.) - OUT OF PRINT

Autumn 1983

7. William T. Littlewood, *A communicative approach to language-teaching methodology* (19pp.)
8. Rose Maclaran, *On the interaction of semantics and pragmatics* (18pp.)
9. E. M. Harding, *Compensation strategies* (54pp.)

Autumn 1984

10. Jeffrey L. Kallen, *Generative phonology in the clinic* (38pp.)
11. Gearóid Ó Ciaráin, *The affective dimension in second/foreign language learning: an interactional perspective* (42pp.)

Spring 1985

12. D. M. Singleton & D. G. Little, *Foreign languages at second level: defining a syllabus, with particular reference to the needs of the senior cycle* (19pp.)
13. John Harris, *The polylectal grammar stops here* (12pp.)

Spring 1986

14. D. G. Little & A. J. Grant, *Learning German without a teacher. Report on a self-instructional programme for undergraduate students of Engineering Science at Trinity College, Dublin, 1982-1984* (60pp.)
15. Máire Owens, *Eithne: a study of second language development* (62pp.)
16. D. Wilson & D. Sperber, *Pragmatics: an overview* (36pp.)

Autumn 1986

17. Ailbhe Ní Chasaide & Eugene Davis, *A data-processing system for quantitative analysis in speech production* (28pp.)
18. Seán M. Devitt, *Learning a foreign language through the media* (69pp.)
19. Meriel Bloor & Thomas Bloor, *Languages for specific purposes: practice and theory* (34pp.)

Spring 1988

20. D. G. Little & D. M. Singleton, *Authentic materials and the role of fixed support in language teaching: towards a manual for language learners* (26pp.)

Spring 1989

21. Seán M. Devitt, *Classroom discourse: its nature and its potential for language learning* (72pp.)
22. V. J. Cook, *The relevance of grammar in the applied linguistics of language teaching* (43pp.)

Spring 1990

23. Sera De Vriendt & Pete Van de Craen, *Bilingualism in Belgium: a history and an appraisal* (52pp.)
24. David Singleton, *The cross-linguistic factor in second language learning: a report on some small-scale studies recently conducted at the CLCS* (20pp.)

(continued on inside back cover)

CLCS Occasional Paper No.50
Autumn 1997

Pragmatic transfer in highly advanced language learners: some preliminary findings*

by

Robert J. Fouser

0 Abstract

Research on language transfer in SLA has consistently shown that learners actively use knowledge of a language or languages that they already know to generate hypotheses about the target language, particularly if it is closely related to one or more of the languages that they already know. Korean learners of Japanese as a second or third language generally view Japanese as an easy language to learn because both languages have similar a syntax, morphology, system of honorifics, and a large common lexicon derived from Chinese characters. Results of an introspective study of language transfer in a highly advanced Korean learner of Japanese as a third language (his second language being "school English") are presented in this paper. A series of tasks that included a verbal report was used to elicit Japanese production and comprehension data. Results from this study showed that the learner drew heavily on his L1 (Korean) in completing the tasks, but that in pragmatic areas of language his performance deviated from generally accepted Japanese linguistic norms to a greater degree than his overall language proficiency would indicate. Results from this study suggest that, although language transfer helps learners attain a high level of global proficiency in a closely related target language, it may be less effective in helping them attain a similar level of pragmatic competence in that language. This suggests that metapragmatic knowledge and affective variables may have a greater influence on the development of pragmatic competence than they do on the development of other areas of target-language competence.

---

* This paper is a revised version of a paper presented at *EUROSLA* 5 at University College, Dublin, Ireland, 8-10 September 1995.

1 Introduction

Language learners and teachers know that interlanguage pragmatics is one of the biggest minefields that learners have to cross in learning another language. Dangerous as this minefield is, most language learners pass through it to communicate successfully in the target language. Breakdowns in communication, or pragmatic failure, have, however, received a great deal of attention in the SLA literature because such failures create misunderstandings that affect how native (or near-native) speakers of the target language view the learner not just as a language learner, but also as a person. Researchers have only begun to find out how pragmatic transfer, affective and cognitive variables, and cross-cultural differences interact with each other in interlanguage pragmatics. A number of researchers (Thomas 1983, Eisenstein and Bodman 1986, Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989, Kasper 1992, Takahashi and Beebe 1992, Ikoma and Shimura 1994) have concluded that pragmatic transfer has a significant effect on interlanguage pragmatics in the target language. Relatively little, however, has been written about how highly advanced language learners with significant exposure to the target language culture and metalinguistic knowledge cope with target-language pragmatics. I define highly advanced language learners as those learners who are between advanced learners in a language course and those persons with near-native proficiency in the language who have stopped studying the language formally or informally. Such learners present the researcher with the challenge of determining how pragmatic transfer interacts with metalinguistic knowledge, affective and cognitive variables, and cross-cultural differences in creating the learner's interlanguage.

Third language acquisition (L≥3) – the acquisition of a language or languages beyond the second language or first foreign language – is another phenomenon that is attracting increasing attention among researchers in SLA (Singleton 1987, Hufeisen 1991, Vogel 1992, Sikogukira 1993, Fouser 1995, Klein 1995). I refer to third language acquisition with the symbol "L≥3" because this symbol includes all languages that are learned after the second language. This symbol spares researchers from having to use a separate numerically based term for each language acquired after the second, e.g., L3, L4, L5, *ad infinitum*. It also allows researchers to classify acquisition phenomena according to the degree of prior language learning experience involved: "L1" for native language acquisition; "L2" for the acquisition of the first non-native language; and "L≥3" for the acquisition of subsequent

non-native languages (Fouser 1994, Hufesien 1995). This definition is broad enough to include learners who range from complete bilinguals learning an L≥3 to those who have minimal proficiency in the L≥3 before learning or acquiring it. The degree of L2 proficiency and the typological relationship between the languages involved will, however, have a strong influence on the process of L≥3 acquisition. Investigating how learners use knowledge of at least two languages in learning an additional language allows researchers to gain greater insight into the cognitive processes that language learners use in second as well as in L≥3 acquisition. L≥3 acquisition research is also important because it sheds light on the effect of previous language learning experience on attitudes, motivation, and learning strategies (Mägiste 1984, Thomas 1988, Nayok et al. 1990).

In this paper, I will bring these two areas of research together by presenting the results of an introspective case study on the interlanguage of a highly advanced Korean learner of Japanese as an L≥3 who has, according to his and my subjective evaluation, intermediate proficiency in English as an L2. The learner, who will be referred by the alias of Min-su in this study, began studying Japanese in Japan and reached a high level of proficiency after two years of full-time language instruction. Min-su's Japanese offers an excellent opportunity to investigate pragmatic transfer into L≥3 because Korean, Min-su's native language, is the closest major language to Japanese syntactically, morphologically, and lexically. Both languages are agglutinating languages with an SOV word order, and they both have a large common lexicon based on Chinese loan words, which will be referred to as "the Sino-Korean lexicon" in this paper (Cho 1994). Both languages also share a system of honorifics that create clearly defined speech levels (Sô,[1] 1984, Sohn 1986, Park 1990) as well as common cultural values based on Buddhism and Confucianism. Despite these broad similarities, differences in culture and in the use of honorifics and speech levels cause particular difficulties for Korean learners of Japanese (Ogino 1989, Lee 1990). How highly advanced learners, such as Min-su, cope with the conflicting signals coming from these similarities and differences will shed light on how pragmatic transfer interacts with metapragmatic knowledge in language learning because, unlike beginning and intermediate language learners, advanced learners with significant contact with the target-language culture, generally have a high level of metapragmatic knowledge.

A secondary goal of this study is to investigate problems of using

data elicitation instruments and procedures with non-Western languages and non-Western participants. Research in recent years has raised similar questions: Rose (1994) questioned the use of discourse completion tasks with non-Western learners, and Robinson (1992) found that her Japanese subjects were influenced by the presence of a native-speaker-of-English researcher in completing a concurrent verbal report. Different writing systems and different cultural values, for example, may make it difficult to adapt methods that are commonly used in the West to non-Western research situations (see Cleary 1988 for a discussion of an English C-test used with native speakers of Arabic).

2 Design

2.1 Background

Within pragmatics, I decided to focus on how Min-su manipulated various speech levels and honorifics in Japanese because the use of speech levels and honorifics in Japanese has both similarities with and differences from the languages that the learner already knows: Korean and English (Martin 1964, Sô 1984, Sohn 1986, Park 1990). Japanese has a complicated system of referent and addressee honorifics that speakers use according to the context of the conversation. How speakers manipulate honorifics determines the level of speech. Native speakers of Japanese determine the context of the conversation by considering the age, sex, status, and social distance of the participants, and their assessments of the context vary considerably according to the individual (Shibatani 1990, Coulmas 1992; see Ide 1979 for a discussion of differences in male and female speech in Japanese). The Japanese system of honorifics is a relative one in which the speaker's relationship to addressee provides the basis of assessment of the context of the conversation (Ogino 1989, Park 1990). In addition to honorifics, Japanese has a system of humble expressions that speakers use to lower themselves while elevating the addressee and related referents.

Korean also has a complicated system of referent and addressee-related honorifics that determine the level of the speech. Koreans also consider the context of the conversation, but are guided more by absolute rules that go beyond the context of the conversation (Martin 1964, Sô 1984). Age and social status, rather than sex and social distance, provide Koreans with the necessary information to assess the context

of the conversation (Sohn 1986, Park 1990). Age has been shown to have the strongest influence on the use of speech levels in Korean (Ogino 1989, Park 1990). Unlike Japanese, Korean has very few humble expressions and thus relies on elevation of the addressee and related referents through the use of honorific expressions.

English, Min-su's L2, was expected to be a negligible source of transfer. This is reinforced in pragmatics by the lack of a well-defined system of honorifics. Speech levels in English vary from speaker to speaker according to the context of the conversation, but the few honorific expressions in English are used to refer directly to the addressee as referent (Sohn 1986). Like native speakers of Japanese, and to a lesser extent Korean, native speakers of English alter their speech according to their perception of social status and social distance (Sohn 1986, Miller 1994); age and sex are less important in English. Speech levels in English are reflected mainly in intonation, word choice, and topic of the conversation (Ide et al. 1986, Sohn 1986). The three languages involved in the study contrast and overlap with each other considerably: Japanese and Korean have elaborate systems of referent and addressee honorifics; English has a system of simple honorific terms of address combined with other linguistic and social indications of speech levels. Japanese and English place importance on social distance, whereas Korean places importance on age and social status.

Conducting research in the Japanese language is also complicated by the writing system, which is composed of three systems of script (four including Romanization, which is often used in advertisements and street signs): the *kana* syllabary, which is composed of two systems of script: *hiragana* and *katakana* (*katakana* is used almost exclusively for imported foreign words), and Chinese logographs (I prefer the term "logograph" to "character" because "logograph" accurately describes how ideas are represented graphically in the Chinese language). These three scripts are mixed together in most writing (see Sampson 1985 for a detailed discussion of the Japanese system of writing). Since the 1950s, the Ministry of Education has limited the number of *kanji* taught in the Japanese school system to 1850, but the system remains complicated because many characters have several pronunciations. The number of words written in *katakana* has increased dramatically in the last several decades.

2.2 Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this research is based on Kellerman's language distance hypothesis (e.g., Kellerman 1979, 1983), which holds that language transfer will occur mainly from the language that learners perceive to be closest to the target language, and that such transfer generally facilitates acquisition. With highly advanced learners who have a considerable amount of metalinguistic knowledge and, in some cases, living experience in the target-language culture, this hypothesis is more difficult to test because metalinguistic and metacultural knowledge also facilitates acquisition (Eisenstein and Bodman 1986, Lee 1990). The perceived language distance hypothesis applies to most native speakers of Korean who learn Japanese as an L2 or, as is often the case in Korea, an L≥3 (six years of English education are required by the end of secondary school in Korea). Because most Korean learners of Japanese perceive Japanese to be closely related to Korean (Lee 1990), and thus easy to learn, they draw actively on Korean syntax and the Sino-Korean lexicon to an even greater degree (Lee 1990, Cho 1994). For many learners, these hypotheses are proven correct, and they continue to draw on their knowledge of Korean syntax and the Sino-Korean lexicon (Cho 1994). Because transfer from Korean syntax and the Sino-Korean lexicon, however, are so successful for Korean learners, many learners rely heavily on all forms of transfer at the expense of developing metalinguistic and metapragmatic knowledge, the latter being necessary for learners to overcome the pragmatic differences between the two languages (Lee 1990). In comparison with Japanese, English is seen as a more difficult language to learn and is thus not a likely source of transfer in most cases.

The underlying hypothesis of this study posits that perceived language distance will help learners attain a high level of proficiency in a language that they perceive to be closely related to the target language (see, for example, Ringbom 1985, Singleton 1987 for confirmation of this hypothesis in L≥3 acquisition; see Gutiérrez 1993 for confirmation in L2 acquisition), but that, as a caveat to this hypothesis, the perception of relatedness between (or among) languages will cause an excessive reliance on language transfer or "over transfer", which will in turn make it difficult for learners to apply metapragmatic knowledge to developing adequate control over pragmatic aspects of the target language. Pragmatic competence in such learners will be more variable than their overall language proficiency indicates (see Kellerman 1995 for a discussion of variation in patterns of transfer between related

languages). The degree of transfer, however, will vary according to the proficiency in the language that is the major source of transfer; the greatest amount of transfer will occur from an L1 that is perceived to be closest to the target language, but transfer from an L2 to an L≥3 will be substantial in cases where the learner is proficient enough in the L2 to view L2 knowledge as transferable to L≥3 (Ringbom 1985, Sikogukira 1993). Ringbom (1985) argued that transfer from L2 to L≥3 is more likely to occur in comprehension, particularly as it relates to the lexicon.

3 Method

3.1 Participants

I asked Min-su to participate in this study and offered to pay him A$50 for roughly six hours of his time. I also offered the same amount of money to Min-su's Japanese friend, who will be given the alias of Takanori in this study, a learner of English in Sydney who had known Min-su for about six months. I asked Takanóri to participate as a native-speaker informant (the eleventh in total). Min-su and Takanori refused to accept the money because they insisted that they were helping me as a personal favor. I had known Min-su and Takanori for about two months before the study began, and asked them to participate in the study because I knew that Min-su had a high level of proficiency in Japanese. I asked Takanori to be the native speaker informant because I wanted to reduce the stress during the data collection by having a native speaker informant who was familiar to Min-su participate in the study. I believe, as does Grotjahn (1987), that the participants and researchers should enter into a communicative relationship in which trust and familiarity encourage participants to reveal more of themselves than they would if the researcher and other participants were strangers.

Immediately after completing a B.A. in biology in 1992 at the National Fisheries University in Pusan, Korea, Min-su went to Japan to study Japanese intensively in preparation for entering a postgraduate course in biology in Japan. Min-su had studied English from the first year of middle school until the end of the second year of university, but he felt that he had learned little during those years of formal English instruction. Min-su's experience learning English in Korea convinced him that he needed to go to Japan if he wanted to learn Japanese rapidly. Min-su had completed two years of Japanese language education at a

JSL (Japanese as a second language) institute in Tôkyô from 1992–94. He decided not to enter a postgraduate course in Japan because of the expense of living in Japan, and went to Australia in 1994 to study English full-time. The data for this study were collected in Sydney in February of 1995 while I was a visiting scholar at the Language Acquisition Research Centre at the University of Sydney. Min-su was 27 years old and Takanori was 24 years old when the data were collected.

3.2 Instruments

The following instruments (see Table 1 for a summary) were used in this study: (1) Japanese C-test; (2) Japanese-to-Korean Translation Task; (3) Japanese DCT (Discourse Completion Task); (4) Japanese Discourse Evaluation Task (DET); (5) Japanese Short Writing Task; (6) Language Learning Experience Questionnaire; (7) Retrospective Interview with the Researcher. I used triangulation – the combination of various data elicitation instruments – to test global language proficiency and to shine a spotlight on interlanguage pragmatics in production and comprehension. In order to gather as much data as possible without placing an excessive burden on Min-su's time, I decided to limit data elicitation to L≥3 Japanese only, rather than attempting to elicit similar data on L1 and L2. The in struments were also designed to gather information on affective and cognitive variables and metapragmatic knowledge.

Table 1 *Summary of Data Elicitation Instruments and Procedures*

Instrument	C-Test	Translation	DCT	DET	Short Writing
Purpose	Global Proficiency	Processing Strategies	Speech Act Production (Speaking)	Speech Act Comprehension (Listening)	Speech Act Production (Writing)
Type	4 Passages 100 Deletions	Descriptive Passage	8 Speech Acts	8 Speech Acts	1 Speech Act
Written Verbal Reports	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Concurrent Verbal Reports	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

The C-test. Research on the C-test has shown that it correlates well with other measures of global language proficiency (Klein-Braley 1985). It has also been used to elicit data on processing strategies (Feldmann and Stemmer 1987) and as a source of information on multilingual interaction in the lexicon (Singleton and Little 1991). Constructing the C-test for Japanese (see Appendix A) was difficult because Japanese is an agglutinating language with no spaces between the elements of one sentence, thus making it more difficult to define a "word" than in Western languages. I decided to follow the definition of a word as a *bunsetsu* because some learners may be familiar with this method, which is often used in beginning Japanese language textbooks, of dividing the elements of a Japanese sentence. A *bunsetsu* is a unit of meaning based on the phonological divisions in a Japanese sentence; it has been traditionally offered by Japanese linguists (Hattori 1960, Shibatani 1990). In most cases, a *bunsetsu* includes a suffixed particle or other morphological alteration with a lexical item. The C-test in this study was composed of four passages with a total of 100 deletions (see Table 2 in the Results and Discussion section for a summary). The passages were based on the following four topics: cherry blossom season in Tôkyô (third person, present tense, 16 deletions); daily routine (first person, present tense, 31 deletions); part-time job experience (first person, present and past tense, 24 deletions); letter of invitation (first person, present tense, 29 deletions). The passages were taken from a textbook for learners of Japanese, which contained only Chinese logographs from among the 500 most frequently used logographs. Because Min-su is a highly advanced learner of Japanese, I altered the passages so that they contained the normal number of Chinese logographs from among the 1850 logographs officially recognized by the Japanese Ministry of Education. Each Chinese logograph was considered equal to a *kana* graph regardless of the pronunciation. Thus, the word *watashi* ("I") is pronounced as three syllables, but written in one Chinese logograph. When combined with the topic marker *wa*, which is written in *hiragana*, the *bunsetsu* (*watashi-wa*) consists of two distinct graphs, one Chinese logograph for *watashi*, and a *hiragana* graph for *wa*, the last half of the *bunsetsu*. In this case, *wa* would be omitted in the C-test.

The use of verbal reports. During the C-test, the Translation Task, and the DCT, I asked Min-su to verbalize his thoughts whenever he wanted to and in whichever language he wanted (see Cohen and Olshtain 1993 for a discussion of the language of thought in concurrent verbal reports).

Feldmann and Stemmer (1987) used concurrent verbalizations to elicit data on cognitive processing of the C-test. I did not ask Min-su to verbalize his thoughts as he completed the DET because he looked tired and I did not want "subject fatigue" to affect the results of the study. I did not train Min-su in the use of concurrent verbal reports because I wanted to see how the instruments affected the type of current verbal report that he used because I did not want to prejudice the results in anyway. Although this differs from the procedure recommended by Ericsson and Simon (1993), which has been used extensively in other studies (e.g., those in Færch and Kasper 1987) I believe that concurrent verbal reports in which the participants are trained and pressured into verbalizing a stream of consciousness may place an excessive burden on their cognitive system (O'Malley and Chamot 1990). Three instruments– – the DCT, the DET, and the Short Writing Task– – contained sections for a written verbal report, which provided important additional information, not only on what the participants might have been thinking as they completed the task, but also on the participants' subjective opinions of their language learning and of the data elicitation instruments themselves. I am not claiming that concurrent verbal reports or written verbal reports provide infallible insight into the inner workings of participants' minds; rather I believe that they provide valuable information that can be used with other data to answer the research questions (see Grotjahn 1987). I also believe that learners' subjective theories about their language learning as described by Grotjahn (1991) are useful in explaining motives and the role of affective variables such as attitudes and motivation.

The Japanese-to-Korean Translation Task. This task was designed to test language transfer from Japanese to Korean in reading comprehension, as well as global language proficiency. Previous research (e.g., Gerloff 1980, Færch and Kasper 1986) has shown that translation exercises with concurrent verbal reports are useful in determining how learners process input from the target language. The text was a half page (B5) introduction to two historical cities in Korea, and was taken from a textbook for advanced Japanese learners of Korean. It had been translated from Korean into Japanese for inclusion in that textbook by a native speaker of Japanese who was fluent in Korean. I chose this text because the subject matter is familiar to most Koreans educated in the Korean school system and because I could compare the original Korean text with Min-su's translation.

The DCT. I chose the DCT for this study because the data can be

compared with that of many other previous DCT-based studies on native and interlanguage speech act realization (e.g., Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989). The DCT was designed to elicit linguistic production data by asking participants to write what they would say in various situations. Although some researchers have questioned the validity of the DCT (see Kasper and Dahl 1991 for a review of research methods in interlanguage pragmatics), particularly with non-Western languages (Rose 1994), it provides an overview of learners' pragmatic competence that is easy to compare with a large number of learners across languages. Because Chinese logographs are difficult to write, I allowed the participants to write their responses exclusively in *kana* or in any mixture of *kana* and Chinese logographs that they wished to use. This freed them to focus on how to come up with an appropriate response to the situation, and it also provided information on how learners who already know Chinese logographs use this knowledge in formulating their response. Each situation in the DCT was designed to elicit data on pragmatic transfer in one of the following speech acts: asking permission, refusals, invitations, making promises, apologies, expressing thanks, expressing opinions, and requests (see Table 3 in the Results and Discussion section for a summary). The situations were taken from everyday life in Sydney and were translated into Japanese from the English language version, which had been pilot-tested on Australian learners of Japanese at the Insearch Language Institute. All the situations were checked for accuracy with long-term residents of Australia, and the translation of the DCT was checked for accuracy by several native speakers of Japanese. A short "introspection" section in which participants were asked to give a short written verbal report followed each situation.

The DET. The DET (Discourse Evaluation Task) was to elicit data on pragmatics in comprehension and on the participants' metapragmatic knowledge (see Steffensen 1986 for a similar study on reading comprehension in English as an L2). This task consisted of eight short speech-act dialogues in Japanese followed by metapragmatic questions in Japanese about the relationship between the speakers and the type of language used in the dialogue (see Koike 1989 for an example of a similar research instrument used to elicit data on pragmatic transfer in native-speakers of English learning Spanish as a second language). Each dialogue included one of the following speech acts: invitations, expressing thanks, expressing disagreement, making promises, apologies, requests, refusals, and expressing emotion. The questions were

given orally in English because this exercise was originally designed for use at the University of Sydney, but I translated orally into Japanese after stopping the tape. Min-su and Takanori wrote their responses to the questions, which were repeated twice, in Japanese on a separate answer sheet. As with the DCT, a short introspection section followed the questions after each situation. Takanori was the only native-speaker informant for this task. Min-su found the dialogues easy to understand, and Takanori felt that the language was correct but unnatural. The dialogues had been corrected and tape-recorded by two native speakers of Japanese who were teachers of beginning Japanese at the University of Sydney.

The Short Writing Task. Because most people in East Asia have traditionally placed importance on the sincerity of the written word (Coulmas 1989), written Japanese often includes more honorifics than normal speech (see Cherry 1988 for a study of written politeness in English). I decided to include a writing task to obtain data on the learner's use of honorifics in this important area of Japanese pragmatics. In the Short Writing Task, Min-su was asked to write a note to his Japanese teacher apologizing for not being able to keep an appointment with his teacher (see Appendix D). This task was designed to elicit data on learners' use of honorifics, formulaic expressions, and polite speech levels in written Japanese. An introspection section was included at the end of the task.

The Language Learning Experience Questionnaire and the Retrospective Interview. I used a questionnaire that was modeled after the questionnaire used by Gardner and Lambert (1972), Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco (1978), and in the Modern Languages Research Project at Trinity College Dublin (see Singleton 1990 for an introduction to the MLRP) to gather information on previous language learning experiences and how these affect attitudes and motivation for learning Japanese. The questionnaire also contained questions about language use, attitudes and motivation, and a separate section on how participants viewed certain aspects of learning Japanese, such as reading and writing Chinese characters. I conducted a retrospective interview with Min-su and Takanori after all the data had been elicited. In this interview, I asked questions about attitudes and motivation that had not been covered adequately in the questionnaire, as well as questions about the study itself and, in particular, the data elicitation instruments. I believe that, as Matsumoto (1993) pointed out, introspective studies should help the participant and researcher improve their sensitivity to

language, so that the experiment may have been beneficial in some way.

All of these instruments had been approved by the Human Ethics Committee at the University of Sydney in October of 1994. These instruments had first been developed to elicit data on pragmatic competence and global language proficiency in intermediate learners of Japanese as a third language in the School of Asian Studies at the University of Sydney.

3.3 Procedure

Pilot testing. Before beginning this study, I had pilot-tested the C-test, the DCT, the DET, the Short Writing Exercise, and the Language Learning Experience Questionnaire on ten native speakers of Japanese in Sydney, who, along with Takanori, will be referred to as native-speaker informants in this study. I had also pilot-tested the instruments on seven intermediate learners of Japanese as a third language at the Insearch Language Institute attached to the University of Technology Sydney (the DET and the Language Learning Experience Questionnaire were not pilot-tested on native speakers of Japanese because I did not have enough time to do so before the present study began). The Japanese-to-Korean Translation Task was the only instrument that had not been tested before the data were collected. The data from native-speaker informants allowed me to establish a "native-speaker norm" for this study, which could be compared with Min-su's responses.

Audio- and video-taped data elicitation. I met Min-su and Takanori at a train station near the University of Sydney and guided them to the recording studio in the Language Centre at the University of Sydney, where the tasks were to be administered. Before the data collection began, I explained the procedure and data elicitation instruments to them and collected a consent form. I recorded Min-su's completion of the C-test, the Japanese-to-Korean Translation Task, and the DCT on video and audio tape in that order; Takanori completed the C-test and the DCT "off camera". I gave the Discourse Evaluation Task (DET) to Min-su and Takanori, but did not record their performance on video or audio tape. The written instructions for all written tasks were given in English because these instruments had been originally designed for native speakers of English learning Japanese. I explained each task to Min-su and Takanori in Japanese and provided a written Japanese translation of the situations in the DCT and of the situation in the Short Writing Task. I asked Min-su to complete all of the tasks without

referring to a dictionary or other reference material. The C-test and the Translation Task took place before lunch; the DCT and the DET took place after lunch.

Post-elicitation data collation. I gave Min-su the Short Writing Task and the Language Learning Experience Questionnaire to complete at home; I asked Takanori to complete the Short Writing Task, but not the questionnaire because it was designed specifically for learners of Japanese as an L≥3 language. I met Min-su and Takanori a week later to collect the Short Writing Task and the Questionnaire, and to interview Min-su about his language learning and living experience in Japan. Because I wanted the retrospective interview to be as relaxed as possible, I interviewed him in Japanese and Korean and took notes by hand instead of using a tape recorder.

3.4 Analysis

All of the above instruments were given equal weight in the analysis and discussion of the results. From the L≥3 data, I was able to deduce patterns of transfer by comparing responses with those of native-speaker informants and by referring to other research, secondary and experimental, on honorifics and speech levels in the languages in question. Because I am fluent in English (L1), Japanese (L3) and Korean (L4), I drew on my own knowledge and intuitions of these languages to augment results from native-speaker informants and from other research. As Grotjahn (1991) asserted, a qualitative analysis allows for great focus on the learner as a whole person, which allows the researcher to draw more detailed conclusions from the data than would be possible with a quantitative analysis.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Global Language Proficiency

The C-test. Min-su scored 89% correct on the C-test, which is close to the average score of eleven native speakers of 94%. "Correct" was considered by native speakers of Japanese to be a grammatically and semantically acceptable response, some of which deviated from the original Japanese text (in a few cases, some native speakers also disagreed on which responses were "correct"). Min-su's scores for each passage were as follows: 94%, 81%, 92%, and 90%. His score of 89% correlates well with his score of 362 (90.5%) on Level 1, the highest

level of the Japanese Language Proficiency Test given by the Japan Foundation each year; the maximum score is 400 and the passing score for Level 1 is 280. Min-su achieved his score of 362 after a year and a half of full-time study in Japan. Learners who pass Level 1 are normally permitted to enter university or postgraduate study in Japan without additional language training.

Table 2 *Results from the C-test*

Passage	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Number of Deletions	16	31	24	29
Topic	Cherry Blossom Season	Daily-routine	Part-time Job	Letter of Invitation
Point of View	Third Person	First Person	First Person	First Person
Tense	Present	Present & Past	Present & Past	Present
Percentage Correct	94%	81%	92%	90%

Min-su filled in the blanks in a mixture of *kana* and Chinese logographs but did not use Chinese logographs as much as the native-speaker informants did. Because Koreans use the Korean alphabet, *han'gûl*, almost exclusively in everyday writing, many Korean learners of Japanese have difficulty writing Chinese logographs, although roughly 1800 Chinese logographs are taught in the school system in Korea (Sampson 1985). In completing the C-test, Min-su read aloud in Japanese and did not translate any words or phrases into Korean. He would stop and repeat the part of a word before a blank that he could not fill in quickly. He verbalized his thoughts about the test only in Japanese by saying that something was *muzukashii* ("difficult") or by saying *wakaranai* ("I don't understand") when he didn't know what to write in the blank. He repeated these words several times in front of blanks that caused him particular difficulty. The video tape of this session revealed pronunciation problems typical of many Korean learners of Japanese: /z/, /t/ and /ts/ caused Min-su minor difficulty in reading aloud, but were intelligible in all cases.

Although Min-su's score on the C-test correlates well with his score on the Japanese Language Proficiency Test, much more research on

the C-test in Japanese is needed to see if it is a valid instrument for assessing global Japanese language proficiency. More tests are needed to see how the *bunsetsu* definition of a word compares with other definitions of a word in Japanese, and how these differences affect learner performance on the C-test. Another important issue in the Japanese C-test is how the use, and particularly the number, of Chinese logographs in the text affects learner performance across languages and in different educational settings. Because Japanese makes extensive use of agglutinating suffixes, it may be that omitting the last half of every other *bunsetsu* shifts the focus of the test to syntactic and morphological features at the expense of the lexicon. A test in which the first half and last half of a *bunsetsu* are omitted in alternation may provide a more balanced view of the learners' global proficiency because more of the lexicon will have been deleted. Testing the C-test on a non-Western language, such as Japanese, is important in determining the extent of the C-test's validity as a measurement of global language proficiency, and in shedding light on how non-Western learners of a Western language may react to the C-test (see Cleary 1988 for a critical discussion of the C-test as a measurement of beginning English proficiency of native-speakers of Arabic).

The Japanese-to-Korean Translation Task. In completing the translation, Min-su read a clause or phrase aloud in Japanese and then translated it directly into Korean. He verbalized the corresponding Korean clause as he wrote, pausing to think occasionally. This type of "clause-to-clause" translation was possible because Korean and Japanese are both SOV languages and because many of the grammatical particles function in a similar way in each language. Min-su was clearly aware of these similarities because he began with rapid clause-to-clause translation from the beginning of the task. In reading the Japanese text, however, Min-su ran into several Chinese logographs that he did not know and that he could not guess from the context. He left these blank in his translation. The task took Min-su a little over 15 minutes to complete.

Although Min-su's translation was semantically accurate, it showed the strong influence of the Japanese text in certain parts. For example, he translated a Japanese passive construction *omowareru* ("be thought of") directly into Korean as *saenggak doeôchinda* ("become thought of") by making use of a pseudo-passive construction, which sounds awkward in Korean (see Shibatani 1990 for a comparison of Japanese and Korean passive constructions). The original Korean text used the simpler form *saenggak handa* ("to think") in this instance. This type of

backchannel appeared in several other cases where the passive had been used in Japanese. A curious backchannel was Min-su's phonetic transcription of the Japanese topic marker *wa* into the Korean alphabet, *han'gûl*, where the Korean topic marker *nûn* would have been placed. *Wa* in Korean is a suffix meaning "and" that is attached to a syllable ending in a vowel. Min-su did not use any Chinese logographs in his Korean translation. Despite the backchannels, Min-su completed the task quickly and accurately without the help of a dictionary or native speaker input. This is further evidence of his high level of proficiency in Japanese.

4.2 Pragmatic transfer

The DCT. The results of the DCT indicated that Min-su's pragmatic competence was more variable on this than on any other task (see Table 3 for a summary). One prominent trend was the use of the Japanese second person pronoun *anata* in situations that would normally call for a more informal term of second-person address or pro-drop. Using *anata* sounds "cold" and objective and is too formal in addressing social equals and family members and too informal in addressing social superiors and strangers (Shibatani 1990). Min-su made less use of the causative form of the verb combined with the honorific verb for receiving *itadaku* than the native-speaker informants had (see Coulmas 1992 for a discussion of the use of *itadaku*). In his responses (see Appendix B) to situations 5 (apology) and 6 (expressing thanks), Min-su used more intimate and direct language than the native speakers of Japanese, and in both cases, his Japanese was considered "too direct" by some of the native-speaker informants because he used the "*yo*" emphatic suffix more than the native speakers would (Shibatani 1990). Min-su's response (see Appendix B) to situation 8, a request for a waiter or waitress to bring a customer's order faster, differed considerably from the Japanese informants because he mixed the polite *masu/desu* level of speech with informal speech; all of the native speaker informants used the *masu/desu* level exclusively because of the significant social distance in the situation (Coulmas 1992, Park 1990). In situation 5, Min-su apologized for being late for an appointment with a close Japanese friend, but did not provide a reason or an excuse for being late, as most native-speaker informants said they would. Furthermore, in the introspection section, Min-su noted that, because his friend would probably forgive him for being late, he didn't need to apologize. This reflects Korean speech levels in which

Table 3 *Comparison of Min-su and Takanori's Responses on the DCT*

Situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Speech Act	Request	Refusal	Invitation	Promise	Apology	Thanks	Disagreement	Complaint
Social Distance	- (telephone)	- (classroom)	- (campus)	- (work)	+ (coffee shop)	+ (tour)	- (friend's house)	+ (restaurant)
Dominance	x = y (friend)	x < y (teacher)	x = y (friend)	x < y (boss)	x = y (friend)	x = y (students)	x = y (friends)	x > y (waitperson)
Age	x = y	x < y	x = y	x < y	x = y	x > y	x = y	?
Min-su's Speech Level	Intimate	*masu/desu* humble (*itadaku*)	Intimate	*masu/desu* honorifics	Intimate	Intimate	Intimate	Intimate *masu/desu*
Min-su's 2nd Person Referent	*You* polite (*anata*)	teacher (*sensei*)	*You* polite (*anata*)	None	None	*You* (pl.) informal	None *(kimitachi)*	None
Takanori's Speech Level	Intimate	*masu/desu* humble (*itadaku*)	Intimate	*masu/desu*	Intimate	*masu/desu*	Intimate humble (*itadaku*)	*masu/desu* humble *(itadaku)*
Takanori's 2nd Person Referent	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

Note. **Social Distance** refers to the situation: - equals "no distance"; + equals "some distance." **Dominance** refers to the power relations in the situation where x = the participant and y = the interlocutor: = equals "nearly equal"; > equals "greater." **Age** refers to the age relations in the situation where x = the participant and y = the interlocutor: = equals "nearly equal"; > equals "older"; < equals "younger"; ? equals "unknown." Participants were asked to define the **gender** relations involved, but neither Min-su nor Takanori did so. Dominance and social distance in these situations were based on general target language (Japanese) cultural norms.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

such speech acts as apologies and expressing thanks are more common in polite speech levels, which are used among strangers and people of differing age and social status rather than with friends or social equals.

In completing the DCT, Min-su read each situation aloud in Japanese, after which he wrote his response silently. He then read his response aloud, making a few minor changes, and proceeded to complete the introspection section briefly before going on to the next situation. This pattern of verbalization of thought differs from the pattern evident in the C-test and the Korean-to-Japanese Translation Task, in which he read his responses aloud and verbalized his thoughts.

Overall, Min-su's usage of honorifics and speech levels showed the greatest amount of variation in the DCT, which when compared with expected native speaker norms in Korean (Cho 1982, Sô 1984, Ogino 1989), indicated that Min-su was applying a significant amount of knowledge of Korean honorifics and speech levels, which emphasize age and social distance, to his Japanese responses. Min-su's use of informal and intimate language in situations 5 and 6 and his directness in situation 8 closely reflected Korean patterns of absolute speech levels.

The DET. Min-su's responses on the DET corresponded closely with Takanori's, and showed less variation from native-speaker norms than his responses on the DCT. All of the dialogues involved two or three exchanges between a man and a woman, which Min-su interpreted as a "boyfriend-girlfriend" relationship. Takanori described the same relationship as "friends". The last of the eight dialogues was designed to be a husband and wife, which both Min-su and Takanori described correctly. The only case of significant divergence occurred in their responses (see Appendix C) to dialogue 4 (making a promise), in which a woman was discussing a man's smoking somewhat critically. The speakers in this dialogue used the *masu/desu* level of speech, an indication that they were not very close. Min-su, however, interpreted their relationship as a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship. In the introspection section, he mentioned that he first thought that the speakers were acquaintances, but that he changed his mind because the woman seemed critical of the man's smoking. To Min-su, such critical feelings would only be expressed in a close or intimate relationship. It is also common for a woman to use the Korean equivalent of the *masu/desu* level of speech in an intimate relationship when the man is older than she is (Cho 1982). This indicates that Min-su was applying his knowledge of Korean speech levels in comprehending the nuances of a relatively simple Japanese dialogue.

More data are needed to determine the validity of the DET as a data elicitation instrument. In this study, the data from the DET should be questioned because Takanori, the native-speaker informant, thought that the dialogues were unnatural, which may have influenced how both he and Min-su responded. Because this instrument was originally developed for intermediate learners, the dialogues were intentionally simple, which may account for why Takanori felt that they were unnatural. The introspection section in the DET proved especially useful in gaining insight into the process that learners use in forming their responses to questions. The DET should be tested on several proficiency levels to determine whether it is a level-specific instrument, or whether it can be used with various levels of proficiency. As a test of metalinguistic knowledge in listening comprehension, the DET holds promise because results from this study confirmed findings from previous research (e.g., Ringbom 1992), in which language transfer was found to be more facilitative in comprehension than in production.

The Short Writing Task. Results from this task indicated that, although Min-su had better control over honorific forms that elevate the listener than he did over humble forms that lower the speaker, his writing was appropriate to the situation. In addressing a social superior in Japanese in a formal situation, both forms are used to show deference to the listener. Korean has far fewer humble forms than Japanese to convey appropriate degrees of respect and deference (Sô 1984). Thus, by not using humble expressions in several cases where the native-speaker informants had, Min-su's writing reflected the influence of the Korean system of honorifics. Min-su also refrained, as he had in completing the DCT, from using the causative form of the verb in combination with the honorific verb of receiving *itadaku*. The use of this combination of forms, however, varied considerably among the native-speaker informants. Native-speaker informants also varied according to sex, with women writing longer responses than men; though the use of honorifics and speech levels was similar among all native-speaker informants. Min-su used far fewer Chinese logographs in this task than the native speakers had, but his use of Chinese logographs was consistent with his use of them on other tasks. Min-su's response overall corresponded most closely in length and style to those of men in their thirties and forties rather than to those of his peer-group, men in their twenties. Takanori's response was more informal than Min-su's and the average of the native speaker informants (see Table 4). In the introspection section of the short-writing task, Takanori noted that he

did not want to be too formal with his teacher because he was familiar with his teacher, and did not think that excessive formality between persons who know each other was appropriate. This reflects the stronger emphasis on familiarity in Japanese pragmatics than in Korean pragmatics, which emphasizes age and social distance (Sohn 1986, Park 1990). It may also reflect changes in attitudes to politeness in Japan among people under thirty.

Table 4 *Comparison of Responses on the Short Writing Task*

Frequency	Min-su	Takanori
Chinese Logographs	19	28
Different Chinese Logographs	14	25
2nd Person Referent (*sensei*)	3 in body	1 in greeting; 1 in body
1st. Person Referent	1	None
Humble Forms	4	2
Honorific Forms	1	None
Formulaic Expressions	1	2

4.3 Language Learning Experiences

The Language Learning Experience Questionnaire and the Retrospective Interview. I met Min-su and Takanori for coffee a week after the audio- and video-taped data elicitation. At that time, I collected the Language Learning Experience Questionnaire and the Short Writing Task, and I asked Min-su questions about his life in Japan and his attitudes toward Japan, the Japanese people, and the Japanese language in a retrospective interview. Results from the Questionnaire indicated that Min-su felt that speaking and listening were "very easy" (1 on a five-point scale of 1 to 5). He considered reading and translating "easy" (score of 2), and writing "average" (score of 3). He used Japanese in a wide variety of situations and was motivated to learn Japanese because of career prospects and interest in contemporary Japanese culture (broadly defined).

On the part of the questionnaire that dealt specifically with questions on the Japanese language (see Appendix E), Min-su found the system of honorifics and the writing system to be the most difficult aspect of learning Japanese. He rated "*keigo* (polite endings)", "reading *kanji* (Chinese logographs)", "writing *kanji*", and "writing system in general" as "average" (score of 3) on the same five-point scale. He rated all other aspects of learning Japanese as "very easy" or "easy" (score of 1 or 2), and no category as "difficult" or "very difficult" (score of 4 or 5). Min-su's perception of difficulty correlated well with his performance on the C-test, the DCT, the DET, and the Short Writing Task: his proficiency was most variable in honorifics and speech levels and in writing Chinese logographs on the DCT and Short Writing Task, both tests of pragmatic competence in linguistic production. This close correlation between Min-su's perception of difficulty and actual performance showed that he was capable of an accurate assessment of his language proficiency, which indicated that he monitored his language performance closely.

Results from my discussion with Min-su revealed that he had relatively few negative feelings toward Japan, although many young Koreans have negative attitudes toward Japan because of the collective memory of 36 years of Japanese colonial rule, from 1910 to 1945. Min-su also commented that he had few negative experiences in Japan and that he admired Japanese economic and technological achievements. He said that he enjoyed studying Japanese, which was evident in his friendship with Takanori in which their common language was Japanese, and that he hoped to continue studying the language in the future. After finishing his studies in Australia, Min-su said that he planned to return to Korea and work in international business in Pusan.

I also brought Min-su's and Takanori's C-test, DCT, and DET to discuss their results. Min-su was very interested in how Takanori viewed his responses, and often asked Takanori how his responses could have been more natural. Takanori praised Min-su's responses, but also offered advice on how to improve certain responses. I also took this opportunity to ask Takanori to critique the instruments. He thought that all of the instruments, except the DET, used natural and correct Japanese. He thought that the C-test was difficult even for native speakers because most Japanese people are not familiar with the test format.

5 Conclusion

Results from this exploratory case study confirmed the hypothesis that highly advanced learners make considerable use of language transfer in learning a target language that they perceive to be closely related to one or more of the languages that they already know. The results also confirmed the caveat to this hypothesis, that heavy reliance on language transfer will cause the pragmatic competence of advanced learners to be less stable than other areas of their language proficiency. Min-su's near-native score on the C-test, combined with his high score on the Japanese Language Proficiency Test, indicated that his overall language proficiency is very high. His performance on tasks designed to elicit information on his pragmatic competence, however, revealed a more irregular pattern: although most of his responses were similar to those of the native-speaker informants, indicating that his Japanese-language education and residency in Japan had helped him develop sufficient pragmatic competence and metapragmatic knowledge, some responses showed the strong influence of Korean pragmatics, creating utterances that sounded awkward in Japanese. Because the C-test and the DET were newly developed instruments for this study and the other instruments had been used in only a few previous studies, the findings from this study are limited. The complex Japanese writing system – Japanese is the only language in the world to use three different writing systems – made it difficult to adapt the C-test to Japanese and difficult to interpret the DCT as data from oral or written language. Clearly, further research is needed on the validity of these and other data elicitation methods in researching Japanese language acquisition.

Although this study focused on pragmatic transfer in a highly advanced language learner, transfer is not the only possible cause of the given results. Metapragmatic knowledge, individual differences, cognitive variables, and differences in formal language education need to be investigated to show how these aspects of pragmatic transfer converge with language transfer in the development of pragmatic competence. Pragmatic patterns specific to the languages that learners already know and the target language may also influence how learners make decisions that affect the development of pragmatic competence. Learners of Japanese, for example, who are not aware of defined speech levels in the language(s) that they already know, will most likely find it more difficult than Min-su to understand how speech levels function in Japanese.

In the end, highly advanced language learners face a dilemma in

getting across the pragmatics minefield. Their high level of proficiency leads native speakers of the language to expect that they are equally proficient in all areas of the target language. Native speakers might be surprised at variable pragmatic proficiency, and particularly at pragmatic failure, in highly advanced learners. At the same time, native speakers might also expect highly advanced language learners to play the "foreigner role" (Janicki 1985), in which native speakers prefer language learners not to have native-like pragmatic proficiency. These conflicting native-speaker expectations present highly advanced learners with the dilemma of being "too good" *and* "not good enough" at the same time – the dilemma of "pragmatic dissonance." How highly advanced language learners find their way out of this dilemma may determine whether their relationship with the target-language culture is on their terms or not.

Note

1 The McCune-Reischauer system of Romanization is used throughout this paper. A circumflex is used instead of a breve. Japanese is Romanized according to *Kenkyusha's Japanese-English Dictionary*. A circumflex rather than a macron is used to indicate long vowels.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Brian Taylor, Director of the Language Centre of the University of Sydney, for inviting me to the University as a visiting scholar from September 1994 to March 1995. I would also like to thank Marie Fellbaum and Mika Fukuta of the Language Acquisition Research Centre at the University of Sydney for their help with the data elicitation instruments. Special thanks go to Park Min-su and Ikeda Takanori for volunteering their time for the study.

References

Blum-Kulka, S., J. House & G. Kasper (eds), 1989: *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cherry, R. D., 1988: "Politeness in written persuasion". *Journal of Pragmatics* 12, pp.63–81.

Cho, C.-H., 1982: *A Study of Korean Pragmatics: Deixis and Politeness.*

(Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.) Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.

Cho, H.-C., 1994: "Kanjikae gakushûsha no tame no kanji kyôiku no arikata: Kankokujin no Nihongo gakushûsha o chûshin ni" ["Teaching Chinese characters to Learners whose languages use Chinese characters: A focus on Korean learners of Japanese"], *Sekai no Nihongo Kyôiku* [*World Japanese Language Education*] 4, pp.61–73.

Cleary, C., 1988: "The C-test in English: Left-hand deletions", *RELC Journal* 19.2, pp.26–38.

Cohen, A., & E. Ohlshtain, 1993: "The production of speech acts by EFL learners", *TESOL Quarterly* 27.1, pp.33–56.

Coulmas, F., 1989: "Function and status of written language in East Asia". In U. Ammon (ed.), *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties*, pp.216–
42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Coulmas, F., 1992: Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*, pp.299–323. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Eisenstein, M., & J. W. Bodman, 1986: "'I very appreciate': Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English, *Applied Linguistics* 7.2, pp.167–85.

Ericsson, K. A. & H. A. Simon, 1993: *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data* (revised edition). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Færch, C., & G. Kasper, 1986: "One learner – two languages: Investigating types of interlanguage knowledge". In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, pp.211–27. Tübingen: Narr.

Færch, C., & G. Kasper (eds), 1987: *Introspection in Second Language Research*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Feldmann, U., & B. Stemmer, 1987: "Thin__ aloud a__ retrospective da__ in C-te__ taking: diffe__ languages - diff__ learners - sa__ approaches?" In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds.), pp.251–67.

Fouser, R. J., 1994: "Justifying L≥3 acquisition research", *Asian Pacific Quarterly* 26.4, pp.10–22.

Fouser, R. J., 1995: "Problems and prospects in third language acquisition research", *Language Research* 31, pp.387–414.

Gardner, R. C. & W. E. Lambert, 1972: *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gerloff, P., 1986: "Second language learners' reports on the interpretive process: Talk-aloud protocols of translation". In J. House & S. Blum-

Kulka (eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, pp.243–62. Tübingen: Narr.

Grotjahn, R., 1987: "On the méthodological basis of introspective methods". In C. Færch & G. Kasper (eds.), pp.54–81.

Grotjahn, R., 1991: "The research programme subjective theories", *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13, pp.187–214.

Gutiérrez, M. G., 1993: "El Español como lengua segunda de un Italiano: Transferencia y distancia lingüística". In J. M. Liceras (Ed.), *La lingüística y el análisis de los sistemas no nativos*, pp.81–123. Ottawa: Dorehouse Editions.

Hattori, S., 1960: *Gengogaku no hôhô* [*Methodology in Linguistics*]. Tôkyo: Iwanami Shôten.

Hedqvist, R., 1985: *Nedelanderes forståelse av danska och svenska: En språk pedagogisk undersökning med utnyttjande av likeheterna mellan språken* [*Learning Dutch through Danish and Swedish: A Pedagogical Study in the Acquisition of Closely Related Languages*]. Umeå Universitet, Institutionerna for fonetik och nordiska språk.

Hufesisen, B., 1991: *Englisch als erste und Deutsch als zweite Fremdsprache: Empirishe Untersuchung zur fremdsprachlichen Interacktion*. Frankfurt: Lang.

Hufeisen, B., 1995: "What is the difference between L2 and L3 aquisition?" Unpublished paper.

Ide, S., 1979: *Onna no kotoba otoko no kotoba* [*Female Speech and Male Speech*]. Tôkyo: Nihon Keizai Tsûshinsha.

Ide, S., T. Ogino, A. Kawasaki & S. Ikuta, 1986: *Nihonjin to Amerikajin no keigo kôdô* [*The Use of Honorific Speech by Japanese and Americans*]. Tôkyo: Namuntô.

Ikoma, T. & Shimura, A., 1994: "Pragmatic transfer in the speech act of refusal in Japanese as a second language", *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 5.1–2, pp.105–29.

Janicki, K., 1985: *The Foreigner's Language: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Press.

Kasper, G., 1992: "Pragmatic transfer", *Second Language Research* 8.3, 203–31.

Kasper, G., & M. Dahl, 1991: "Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics", *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13, pp.215–47.

Kellerman, E., 1983: "Now you see it, now you don't". In S. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.), *Language Transfer in Language Learning*, pp.112–34.

Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Kellerman, E., 1979: "Transfer and non-transfer: Where we are now", *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 2, pp.37–57.
Kellerman, E., 1995: "Crosslinguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere?", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 15, pp.125–50.
Klein, E. C., 1995: "Second versus third language acquisition: Is there a difference?", *Language Learning* 45, pp.419–65.
Klein-Braley, C., 1985: "A close-up on the C-test", *Language Testing* 2, pp.76–104.
Koike, D. A., 1989: "Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts and interlanguage", *The Modern Language Journal* 73.3, pp.279–90.
Lee, P.-H., 1990: "Jôkyû no nihongo kyôiku: Kankokjin gakushûsha no ba'ai" ["Advanced-level Japanese Education: The case of Korean learners"], *Nihongo Kyôiku* [*Journal of Japanese Language Education*] 71, pp.33–43.
Mägiste, E., 1984: "Learning a third language", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 5.5, pp.415–21.
Martin, S., 1964: "Speech levels in Japan and Korea". In D. Hymes (ed.), *Language, Culture, and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*, pp.407–15. New York: Harper & Row.
Matsumoto, K., 1993: "Verbal-report data and introspective methods in second language research: state of the art", *RELC Journal* 24.1, pp.32–60.
Miller, L., 1994: "Japanese and American indirectness", *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 5.1–2, pp.37–55.
Naiman, N., M. Fröhlich, H. H. Stern & A. Todesco, 1978: *The Good Language Learner* (Research in Education Series, 7). Toronto: Ontario Institute of Studies in Education.
Nayok, N., N. Hansen, N. Krueger & B. McLaughlin, 1990: "Language-learning strategies in monolingual and mulitilingual adults", *Language Learning* 40.2, pp.221–44.
Ogino, T., 1989: "Taishô shakai gengogaku to nihongo kyôiku: Nikan no keigo yôhô no taishô kenkyû o rei ni shite" ["Contrastive sociolinguistics and Japanese language education: An example from contrastive research on the use of honorifics in Japanese and Korean"], *Nihongo Kyôiku* [*Journal of Japanese Language Education*] 69, pp.47–63.
O'Malley, J. M., & A. U. Chamot, 1990: *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Park, M.-R., 1990: "Conflict avoidance in social interaction: A sociolinguistic comparison of the Korean and Japanese honorific systems". In H. Hoji (ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics*, pp.111–27. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Ringbom, H., 1985: "The influence of Swedish on the English of Finnish learners". In H. Ringbom (Ed.), *Foreign Language Learning and Bilingualism*, pp.39–58. Åbo, Finland: Åbo Akademi (Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation).

Ringbom, H., 1992: "On L1 transfer in L2 comprehension and L2 production", *Language Learning* 42.1, pp.85–112.

Robinson, M. A., 1992: "Introspective methodology in inter-language pragmatics research". In G. Kasper (ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as Native and Target Language*, pp. 27-82. University of Hawaii at Manoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, Technical Report No.3.

Rose, K. R., 1994: "On the validity of discourse completion tests in non-Western contexts", *Applied Linguistics* 15.1, pp.1–14.

Sampson, G., 1985: *Writing Systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Shibatani, M., 1990: *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sikogukira, M., 1993: "Influence of languages other than the L1 on a foreign language: a case of transfer from L2 to L3", *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* 4, pp.110–32.

Singleton, D., 1987: "Mother and other tongue influence on learner French: A case study". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 9, pp.327–46.

Singleton, D., 1990: "The TCD Modern Languages Research Project: Objectives, instruments and preliminary results". CLS Occasional Paper No.26. Dublin: Trinity College, Centre for Language and Communication Studies.

Singleton, D., & D. Little, 1991: "The second language lexicon: Some evidence from university-level learners of French and German", *Second Language Research* 1, pp.61–81.

Sô, C.-S., 1984: *Ch'ondaepôp ui yôn'gu: Hyônhaeng dea'upôp ui ch'egye wamunchejôm* [*Research on Honorific and Polite Speech in Korean: Problems and Structure of the Present System of Honorifics*]. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.

Sohn, H.-m., 1986: "Cross-cultural patterns of honorifics and socio-

linguistic sensitivity to honorific variables: Evidence from English, Japanese, and Korean". In H.-m. Sohn (ed.), *Linguistic Expeditions*, pp.411–39. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.

Steffensen, M., 1986: "Register, cohesion, and cross-cultural reading comprehension", *Applied Linguistics* 7.1, pp.71–85.

Takahashi, T. & L. M. Beebe, 1992: "Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction". In S. Blum-Kulka & G. Kasper (eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, pp.138–57. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, J., 1988: "The role played by metalinguistic awareness in second and third language learning", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 9, pp.235–46.

Thomas, J., 1983: "Cross-cultural pragmatic failure", *Applied Linguistics* 4.2, pp.93–112.

Vogel, T., 1992: "English und Deutsch gibt es immer krieg: Sprachverarbeitungsprozesse beim Erwerb des Deutchen als dritte Sprache", *Zielsprache Deutsch*, 23.2, pp.95–99.

Author's address:

701 Royal Heights Shinyashiki
2-25-12 Shinyashiki
Kumamoto 862
Japan
e-mail: rjfouser@twics.com

Appendix A:

Example from the C-test

Original Japanese C-test Passage #1 with Instructions and Min-su's Responses:

C-test

Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese as a
Third Language Research Project

Name: _____

The last half of every second word has been deleted in the following four passages. Where a word is composed of an odd number of *hiragana* and/or *kanji*, the greater number of *hiragana* and/or *kanji* has been deleted. Please complete the words with deletions by filling in the blank given at the end of each word. In filling in the blank you may write in any combination of *kana* and *kanji*.

Example:

わたしは去年の４月から日本語学校で勉強しています。わたしの
クラ＿＿＿＿ いろいろな国＿＿＿＿ 人が１５＿＿＿＿ います。
み＿＿＿＿ 明るくて、しん＿＿＿＿ いいクラスメ＿＿＿＿。

C-test Passage #1

Note:
Min-su's responses are underlined.

日本では、４月に新学期が始まりますので、あちこちで入学式が行われます。
東京では、ちょうど そのころサクラの 花が満開に なります。 上野公園を 始じめ、
あちこちのサクラの名所は、お花みに行く 人でにぎやになります。サクラの下で、
お弁当を 食べたり、パーティを する人も 多いです。夜に なると、電気を たくさん
並べて「夜桜」見ぶつします。これは 大変 きれいです。

Romanized Version of C-test Passage #1:

Note:

Min-su's responses are given in bold with errors in bold italics. Variations from the original text that could be considered correct are noted in bold underlined italics. Long vowels are indicated by repeating the vowel twice. Words and responses written in Chinese characters are given in capital letters. Divisions between "words" or *bunsetsu* are note with an astrisk.

NIHON-dewa,* shiGATSU-ni* SHINGAKKI-ga* HAJImarimasu-node,* achi-kochi-de NYUGAKUSHIKI-ga* OKONOwaremasu. *TOOKYOO-dewa,* chyoodo*sono* koro sakura-no* HANA-ga* MANKAI-ni* narimasu. *UENO-KOOEN-o* HAjime,* achi-kochi-no* sakura-no* MEISHO-wa,* oHANAmi-***ni IKU*** *HITO-de* nigi***ya-ni*** narimasu. * sakura-no* SHITA-de, *oBENTOO-o* TAbetari,* patei-o*suru* HITO-mo* OOi-desu. * YORU-ni* naruto,* DENKI-o* takusan* NARAbete* "YOZAKURA"* KENbutsu* shimasu.* kore-***wa*** TAIHEN* kirei-desu.

Loose English Translation of the C-test Passage #1:

A lot of school entrance ceremonies are held in April in Japan because school starts at the beginning of that month. This is also the season in which the cherry blossom come into full bloom in Tokyo. Famous parks, such as Ueno Park, are full of people who have come to enjoy the cherry blossoms. Many people like to sit under the cherry blossoms to have a picnic or a party. In the evening, a lot of people come to see the cherry blossoms lit up by lights that are strung among the trees. This is truly a beautiful sight.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B:

Examples from the Discouse Completion Task (DCT)

Instructions:

Discourse Completion Test

Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese as a
Third Language Research Project

Name: _____

In this exercise you will be asked to write what you would say in Japanese in various situations. Please read the short description of each situation and think about what you might say in response to this situation. Write your response in the space provided. You may say as little or as much as you wish, and you may also choose to say nothing. You may write in any mixture of *kana* and *kanji*. Please choose the gender of the person you are speaking with by circling 'him' or 'her' when you see these words in the description.

In the 'introspection' section following each situation, please write why you wrote what you did immediately after finishing your response. Again, you may write as little or as much as you wish. Please feel free to write your comments in any language because your comments can be translated from that language into English later.

English Original, Japanese Translation, Romanization of Situations with Min-su's and Takanori's Responses in Japanese, Romanization, and English Translation:

Situation 5:

You have an appointment with a close Japanese friend. You were supposed to meet him or her at 3:00 p.m. at a café in Gleebe. You are usually on time, but this time you left home a little late and then missed the bus, causing you to wait 20 minutes for another bus. You arrive at 3:40 p.m. and apologize for being late.

あなたは３：００にGleebeにある喫茶店で親しい日本人の友人と会う約束があります。普通約束時間をよく守る方ですが、今回は家を出るのが少し遅れ、バスを二十分ぐらい待たなければなりませんでした。３：４０にようやく到着して彼または彼女に謝ります。

Anata wa 3:00 ni Gleebe ni aru KISSATEN de SHITAshii NIHONJIN no YUUJIN to Au YAKUSOKU ga arimasu. FUTSUU YAKUSOKU JIKAN o yoku MAMOru

HOO desu ga, KONKAI wa IE o DEru no ga SUKOshi OKUre, basu o NIJUPPUN gurai MAtanakereba narimasendeshita. 3:40 ni yooyaku TOOCHAKU shite KARE mata wa KANOJO ni AYAMArimasu.

Min-su:

What would you say?

４０分もまたせてほんとうにごめんね。

40 PUN mo matasete hontoo ni gomen ne.

"Sorry for making[causing] you wait for 40 mintues."

Introspection:

これまでちゃんと約束をまもったからりかいをしなくてもわかってくれるとおもうから

kore made chanto YAKUSOKU wo mamotta kara rikai shinakute mo wakatte kureru to omou kara.

"I think that he will forgive me without an apology because I've always been on time before."

Takanori:

What would you say?

ごめんごめん、バスに乗りそこなって遅れちゃった。

gomen gomen, basu ni NOrisoko natte OKUrechatta.

"Sorry, sorry -- I'm late because I missed the bus."

Introspection: None

Situation 6:

You have volunteered to show a group of Japanese high school exchange students around Sydney for the day. You have now come to the end of the tour and everyone thanks you for your time and consideration. Several students approach you and

present you with a gift from the entire group in appreciation for the tour.

あなたは日本から来た高校生の留学生たちにシドニーを一日案内してあげました。ツアーが終わり、学生たちは感謝の気持ちで一杯です。彼らのうちの数人がグループを代表してあなたにプレゼントを送ります。

anata wa NIHON kara KIta KOOKOOSEI no RYUUGAKUSEI-tachi ni shidonii o ICHINICHI ANNAIshite agemashita. tsuaa ga Owari, GAKUSEI-tachi wa KANSHA no KIMOchi de IPPAI desu. KAREra no uchi no SUUNIN ga guruupu o DAIHYOO shite anata ni purezento o OKUrimasu.

Min-su:

What would you say?

ありがとう。ぼくも君たちのおかげで一日たのしくおくったよ。

arigatoo, boku mo KIMItachi no okage de ICHINICHI tanoshiku okutta yo.

"Thanks. I had a pleasant day thanks to you guys."

Introspection:

None

Takanori:

What would you say?

大変、どうもありがとうございます。こんなたいそうな贈り物をいただき恐縮します。本当にありがとう。

TAIHEN, doomo arigatoo gozaimasu. konna taisoona OKUriMONO o itadaki KYOOsyuku shimasu. HONTOO ni arigatoo.

"Thank you very much. I never expected to get such a wonderful gift. Really, thanks a lot."

Introspection: None

Situation 8:

You are in Japan. You go out to a moderately priced restaurant for lunch with a friend. You have been waiting quite a while for your order, and both of you have something to do right after lunch. You are worried that you may not have enough time to eat. You get the waitperson's attention successfully. He or she comes over to your table, and you ask him or her to bring your order as soon as possible.

あなたは日本にいます。友人といっしょに価格の手頃なレストランで昼ご飯を食べようとしていますが、注文した後食事がなかなか出て来ません。１：００にはすぐ用事が入っているので食べる時間があるから心配になって来ました。そこで、従業員を呼んでもう少し早く食事を持って来ることが出来ないかと頼みます。

anata wa NIHON ni imasu. YUUJIN to isshoni KAKAKU no TEGORONa resutoran de HIRO goHAN o TAbeyoo to shite imasu ga, CHUUMON shita ATO SHOKUJI ga nakanaka DEte KImasen. 1:00 ni wa sugu YOOJI ga arukara SHIMPAI ni natte KImashita. sokode, JUUGYOOIN o YOnde moo SUKOshi HAYAku SHOKUJI o MOtte KUru kotoga DETEKOnai ka to TANOmimasu.

Min-su:

What would you say?

３０分前に注文したけどまだでてこないよ。ちょっといそいでくれませんか。１：００時用事がありますので時間ないですけど。

30 PUN MAE ni CHUUMON shita kedo mada dete konai yo. chyotto isoide kuremasen ka? 1:00 JI YOOJI ga arimasu node JIKAN nai desu kedo.

"We placed our order 30 minutes ago, but we haven't gotten anything yet. Could you please hurry? We don't have time [to wait] because we have an appointment at 1:00"

Introspection:

事情をはなしたらたしかめてくれるとおもうから。

JIJOO wo hanashitara tashikamete kureru to omou kara

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"I think that they will bring the food if I explain the situation."

Takanori:

What would you say?

すいません。これから用事がありますので、いそいでいただきませんか。

suimasen. kore kara YOOJI ga arimasu node, isoide itadakimasenka.

"Excuse me. We have something to do [after lunch], so could you please see if you can't rush things.

Introspection: None

Appendix C:

Example from the Discourse Evaluation Task (DET)

Instructions:

Discourse Evaluation Task

Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese as a
Third Language Research Project

Name: _____

You will hear eight dialogues in Japanese. After each dialogue, you will hear three questions about the dialogue in English. Please listen to the dialogue and answer the questions in English or Japanese on this form. The first question is the same for each dialogue, but the second and third questions are different.

In the 'introspection' section following each group of questions, please write any comments that you might have on the dialogue or on one or more of the questions immediately after finishing the last question. For example, your comments may be about how you came up with the answer(s) that you gave, or on any other topic that was one your mind when you listened to the dialogue and answered the questions. You may write as little or as much as you wish. Please feel free to write your comments in any language because your comments can be translated from that language into English later.

Japanese Original, Romanization, and English Translation of Dialogue 4:

W: 中村さんは一日にタバコを何本吸いますか。
M: 二十本ぐらい吸います。
W: たくさん吸いますね。病気になりますよ。
M: では、今日から十本にします。
W: 本当ですか。
M: はい、約束します。

W: NAKAMURA-san wa ICHINICHI ni tabako o NANBON SUimasuka?
M: NIJUPPON gurai SUimasu.
W: takusan SUimasu ne. BYOOKI ni narimasu yo.
M: dewa, ASHITA kara JUPPON ni shimasu.
W: HONTOO desuka?
M: hai, YAKUSOKU shimasu.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

W: How many cigarettes do you smoke a day, Mr. Nakamura?
M: About twenty.
W: You smoke quite a lot. You'll get sick, you know.
M: OK, I cut down to ten a day from tomorrow.
W: Really?
M: Yes, I promise.

Questions in English with Min-su's and Takanori's Responses in Japanese, Romanization, and Enlish Translation:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers?

Min-su:
しりあいどうし ---> 恋人どうし

shiriai dooshi ---> KOIBITO dooshi

"acquaintances ---> boyfriend and girlfriend"

Takanori:
知りあったばかりの友達同志

SHIriatta bakari no TOMO-DACHI DOOSHI

"Friends who haven't known each other long."

2. What is a more polite form of "BYOOKI ni narimasu yo" in Japanese?

Min-su:
病気でもなりましたらどうなさいますか。

BYOOKI demo narimashitara doo nasaimasuka?

"What would you do if you were to become ill?"

Takanori:
ご病気にかかれあそばれます。

goBYOOKI ni kakareasobaremasu

"You may become ill."

3. How serious is the man's promise to cut down on smoking?

Min-su:
きのうまで２０本すってた人が今回で１０本でへりすなんてしんらいがほとんどない。

kinoo made 20 PON sutteta hito ga KONKAI de 10 PON de herisu nante shinrai ga hotondo nai

"It's almost impossible to believe that someone who smoked twenty cigarettes a day could cut down to ten a day just like that."

Takanori:
３０%位信頼できる。恐らく約束を破るだろう。

30% I SHINRAI dekiru. OSOraku YAKUSOKU o YABUru daroo.

"I believe him about 30%. He'll probably break his promise."

Introspection:

Min-su:
かのじょもかれに気になっているし、かれもかのじょに気があるみたいから、恋人どうしになるみたい。

kanojo mo kare ni KI ni natte iru shi, kare mo kanojo ni KI ga aru mitai kara, KOIBITO dooshi ni aru mitai.

"They both seem to be paying a lot of attention to each other, so it seems like they are boyfriend and girlfriend.

Takanori: None

Appendix D:

Example from the Short Writing Task

Instructions:

Paragraph Writing Exercise

Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese as a
Third Language Research Project

Name: _____

Please write a one-paragraph note to your Japanese teacher in Japanese based on the following situation in the space provided below. You may write in any combination of kana and kanji that you wish.

In the 'introspection' section at the bottom of this page, please write why you wrote what you wrote after finishing your response. You may write as little or as much as you wish. Please feel free to write your comments in any language because your comments can be translated from that language into English later.

English Original, Romanization, Japanese Translation of the Situation:

You have an appointment with your Japanese teacher to discuss the results of a recent homework assignment. Something came up suddenly in your life, forcing you to cancel the appointment. You go to your teacher's office to tell him or her of this turn of events, but he or she is not in. Please leave him or her a note apologising for not being able to keep the appointment. Begin with the greeting and end with the closing.

あなたは今回の宿題について相談するため日本語の先生と会う約束がありますが、急用のため約束を取り消さなければならなくなりました。その旨を先生に説明するために研究室に行きますが、先生がいません。その約束を守ることが出来ないことを告げるメモを残して下さい。挨拶から終わりまで書いて下さい。

Anata wa KONKAI no SHUKUDAI ni tsuite SOODAN suru tame NIHONGO no SENSEI to Au YAKUSOKU ga arimasu ga, KYUUYOO no tame YAKUSOKU o TOriKEsanakereba naranaku narimashita. sono MUNE o SENSEI ni SETSUMEI suru tame ni KENKYUUSHITSU ni IKImasu ga, SENSEI ga imasen. sono YAKUSOKU o MAMOru koto ga DEKInai koto o TSUgeru memo o NOKOshi KUDAsai. AISATSU kara Owari made KAite KUDAsai.

Japanese Original, Romanization, and English Translation of Min-su's Response:

今日先生と相談することになっているミンスですが、とつぜんの急用のためお会いすることができなくてもうしわけないです。先生に会って事情をはなそうとおもったのですが、あいにく先生には研究室にいらっしゃらないのでしつれいながらこのメモでおかわりしますのでどうかおゆるしください。

民透

KYOO SENSEI to SOODAN suru koto ni natte iru min-su desu ga, totsuzen no KYUUYOO no tame ni oAIsuru koto ga dekinakute mooshiwake nai desu. SENSEI ni ATte JIJOO o hanasoo to omotta no desu ga, ainiku SENSEI ni ha KENKYUUSHITSU ni irassharanai node shitsurei nagara kono memo de okawari shimasu node dooka oyurushi kudasai. sore dewa kuwashii JIJOO wa kondo ohanashi shimasu.

MIN-SU

I am Min-su, and I had an appointment with you today. I am sorry to inform you that I have to cancel the appointment because something sudden came up. I had wanted to explain my situation to you in person, but you were not in when I went to your office, so I am leaving you this memo instead. I hope that you will understand my situation. I will explain it in detail when I meet you again.

Min-su

Introspection:

None

Japanese Original, Romanization, and English Translation of Takanori's Response:

A先生へ、

宿題の結果の件のことなんですが、急用がはいったので行けなくなりました。済みませんが、また次の機会によろしくお願いします。直いうちに先生のところへ伺わせて頂きます。本当に勝手なことを言って済みません。失礼します。

池田高法

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A SENSEI e,

SHUKUDAI no KEKKA no KUDAN no koto nandesu ga, KYUUYOO ga haitta node Ikenaku narimashita. SUmimasenga, mata TSUGI no KIKAI ni yoroshiku ONEGAi shimasu. CHIKAi uchi ni SENSEI no tokoro e UKAGAwasete ITADAkimasu. HONTOO ni KATTEna koto o Itte SUmimasen. SHITSUREI shimasu.

Ikeda Takanori

Professor A,

I have an appointment with you today to discuss my homework, but something came up and I'm afraid that I can't make it today. I'm sorry to bother you, but I'd appreciate it if you could meet me some other time. Please let me visit you soon to discuss this matter with you. I'm sorry if this note seems too abrupt. Please forgive me [I was rude].

Ikeda Takanori

Introspection

絶対に避けられない急用のため、"行けなくなりました"と言いました。

ZETTAI ni SAkerarenai KYUUYOO no tame, "Ikenakunarimashita" to Iimashita.

"I used the phrase 'I can't make it' because I absolutely couldn't get out of what I had to do."

Appendix E:

Example from the Language Learning Experience Questionnaire

Questions and Min-su's Responses:

Part 6: Japanese Language Learning Experience

1. How would you describe the following areas of learning Japanese?

Please circle the appropriate number on the following scale: 1 = Very Easy; 2 = Easy; 3 = Average; 4 = Difficult; 5 = Very Difficult

Easy/Difficult

	Very Easy	Easy	Average	Difficult	Very Difficult
Changes in verb endings	(1)	2	3	4	5
Cultural background	1	(2)	3	4	5
Grammatical particles	1	(2)	3	4	5
Keigo (polite endings)	1	2	(3)	4	5
Pronunciation	1	(2)	3	4	5
Reading *kanji*	1	2	(3)	4	5
Vocabulary	1	2	(3)	4	5
Word order	1	(2)	3	4	5
Writing *kanji*	1	2	(3)	4	5
Writing system in general	1	2	(3)	4	5

2. Do you plan to go to Japan in the near future?

Yes [√]

No [ ]

If yes, please describe your plans

Year(s)	Length of Stay	Purpose of Visit
?	three months	visit friends/ tourism

(purpose) _____

You have now reached the end of this questionnaire. Thank you very much for your participation.

© 1997
Robert J. Fouser

Autumn 1990

25. Paul Farrell, *Vocabulary in ESP: a lexical analysis of the English of electronics and a study of semi-technical vocabulary* (82pp.)

26. David Singleton, *The TCD Modern Languages Research Project: objectives, instruments and preliminary results* (19pp.)

27. Federica Scarpa, *Contrastive analysis and second language learners' errors: an analysis of C-test data elicited from beginners in Italian* (47pp.)

Spring 1991

28. Jennifer Ridley, *Strategic competence in second language performance: a study of four advanced learners* (95pp.)

29. Susan Abbey, *A case for on-going evaluation in English language teaching projects* (43pp.)

Spring 1992

30. Frank Donoghue, *Teachers' guides: a review of their function* (51pp.)

31. Barbara Byrne, *Relevance Theory and the language of advertising* (76pp.)

Summer 1992

32. Jonathan West, *The development of a functional-notional syllabus for university German courses* (50pp.)

33. James Mannes Bourke, *The case for problem solving in second language learning* (23pp.)

Autumn 1992

34. Tom Hopkins, *Intertextuality: a discussion, with particular reference to* The Waste Land (28pp.)

35. David Singleton & Emer Singleton, *University-level learners of Spanish in Ireland: a profile based on data from the TCD Modern Languages Research Project* (12pp.)

Spring 1993

36. Frank Maguire, *Sign languages: an introduction to their social context and their structure* (39pp.)

37. Ema Ushioda, *Acculturation theory and linguistic fossilization: a comparative case study* (54pp.)

Summer 1994

38. Carl James, Phil Scholfield & George Ypsiladis, *Cross-cultural correspondence: letters of application* (28pp.)

39. Dieter Wolff, *New approaches to language teaching: an overview* (18pp.)

Spring 1995

40. James A. Coleman, *Progress, proficiency and motivation among British university language learners* (38pp.)

Summer 1995

41. Terence Odlin, *Causation in language contact: a devilish problem* (40pp.)

42. Dee McGarry, *An integrated ESL and cultural studies syllabus* (43pp.)

Spring 1996

43. Terence Odlin, *"Sorrow penny yee payed for my drink": taboo, euphemism and a phantom substrate* (24pp.)

44. Michael Sharwood Smith, *The Garden of Eden and beyond: on second language processing* (20pp.)

45. Diana Masny, *Examining assumptions in second language research* (24pp.)

Summer 1996

46. David Little & Helmut Brammerts (eds), *A guide to language learning in tandem via the Internet* (24pp.)

Spring 1997

47. Barbara Lazenby Simpson, *Social distance as a factor in the achievement of pragmatic competence* (60pp.)

48. Danièle Tort-Moloney, *Teacher autonomy: a Vygotskian theoretical framework* (54pp.)

49. Terence Odlin, *Hiberno-English: pidgin, creole, or neither?* (39pp.)

Autumn 1997

50. Robert J. Fouser, *Pragmatic transfer in highly advanced learners: some preliminary findings* (44pp.)

51. Hans W. Dechert, *What's in a life?* (19pp.)